

through a third computing device formed as a firewall; supplying from the first computing device a query signal to the third computing device formed as a firewall; testing the query signal by the third computing device formed as a firewall; supplying by the third computing device, when a predetermined query signal is available, the query signal to a fourth computing device formed as a proxy; testing the query signal by the fourth computing device formed as a proxy; and establishing by the fourth computing device formed as a proxy when a predetermined parameter is available through the third computing device formed as a firewall a data connection between the first and the second computing device, wherein the data connection between the first and the second computing device is established by the first computing device to the fourth computing device and back from the fourth computing device to the third computing device.

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over the patent to Yarborough, et al.

Claims 6, 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Yarborough in view of the patent to Coley.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds over the rejection of the claims over the art, applicants canceled claim 4 and amended claim 1 by introducing into it the features of this claim.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended clearly and patentably distinguish the present invention from the prior art.

In the Office Action the Examiner applied the art; however the cited art does not describe the use of target addresses and sender addresses and a method for changing the addresses. In the Examiner's opinion it may be hard to hide the client from the public network in a network address translation system. However, this is not the focus of the amended claim 1, since in the amended claim 1 there is no hiding of an internal address to the public, but instead the fourth computing device changes the sender address which may be an address of the first computing device into its own address. Therefore, the second computing device always responds not directly to the first computing device, but to the fourth computing device. It is believed to be clear that there is no intention to hide the address of the internal second computing device.

Thus, a person skilled in the art would not find in the prior art any hint or suggestion to use the method steps as now defined in the amended claim 1.

The Examiner rejected original claim 1 as being anticipated. In connection with this it is believed to be advisable to cite the decision in re Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) in which it was stated:

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim."

Definitely, the prior art applied by the Examiner does not include each and every element of the method in accordance with the present invention as defined in the amended claim 1. Therefore, it is believed that the anticipation rejection should be considered as not tenable and should be withdrawn.

Applicants have submitted a new independent claim 13. This claim, in addition to and in combination with the features of the original claim 1, defines that a data connection between the first and the second computing

device is established by the third computing device to the fourth computing device and back from the fourth computing device to the third computing device. This is described in the specification, for example on page 15, second paragraph, and shown in Figure 2.

The features of claim 13 are also not disclosed in the references, and also can not be derived from them as a matter of obviousness. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 13 should also be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should also be allowed.

Finally, claim 8 has been amended by incorporating into it the features of claim 9. Thus, claim 8, in addition to its original features, now defines that the computing devices are formed so that data are exchanged between the first and second computing devices through the third and fourth computing devices, while the fourth computing device changes sender and/or target addresses of the exchange data.


The features of this claim are also not disclosed in the prior art applied by the Examiner and can not be derived from it as a matter of obviousness. Therefore, claim 8 should also be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should also be allowed.

As for the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on the corresponding independent claims, and share their presumably allowable features.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection and to allow the present application.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233